

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 5TH NOVEMBER 1986

Present: Hon'ble Shri Ch. ~~X~~. Ramakrishna Rao, Member(J)

Hon'ble Shri P. Srinivasan, Member(A)

APPLICATION NO. 185 & 186 of 1986

1. Sri V. R Venkatesh,  
S/o. Ramaswamy,  
(Operative-cum-Supervisory),  
Central Automatic Telephone Exchange,  
Ringwood Circle,  
Bangalore-8.

2. Smt. Jayalakshmi Ramaswamy,  
W/o Ramaswamy,  
Supervisor,  
Ulsoor Automatic Telephone Exchange,  
Ulsoor, Bangalore-8.

Applicants

(Shri M.S. Anandaramu, Advocate)  
Vs.

1. The Union of India by the  
Secretary to the Government  
of India, Ministry of Communi-  
cations and Ex-Officio Director  
General, Posts & Telegraphs,  
Samachar Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. The General Manger, Telephones  
Bangalore District,  
Kempe Gowda Rd. Bangalore-9,
3. The Deputy General Manager,  
Telephones, Bangalore Telephones,  
Kempe Gowda Road,  
Bangalore-9.

(Shri M.S. Padmarajaiah, Advocate)

The applicant has come up for hearing before this  
Tribunal to-day, Member(A), made the following:

ORDER

These applications which originated as writ  
petitions before the High Court of Karnataka, have  
since been transferred to this Tribunal. Shri M.S.

*P. S. Srinivasan*

Anandaramu, learned counsel for the applicants requested that the applications be taken up for hearing today though they were not listed for today. Shri Padmarajiah, learned counsel for the respondents argued the case for the respondents at out direction.

2. The grievance of the two applicants before us here is that they were wrongly reverted from the post<sup>of</sup> Supervisors (Operative-cum-Supervisory) to <sup>those</sup> that of Telephone Operators by an order dated 12.6.1979 passed by the third respondent, <sup>though</sup> since they had been promoted to the post of Supervisors on a regular basis by an order dated 5.7.1978.

3. Shri M.S. Anandaramu, learned counsel for the applicants draws our attention to application No.226 of 1986, which was disposed of by this Tribunal by order dated 24.10.1986 and states that the facts in the instant case are identical <sup>with</sup> to those which obtained in application No.226/86. He, therefore, pleads that the order passed in application No. 226/86 may be followed while disposing of the present application.

4. Shri Padmarajiah, learned counsel for the respondents, while admitting that the facts in these applications are the same as in application No.226/86 reiterates the arguments made by him when those applications were heard and strongly contends that these applications be dismissed.


In this connection he relies on the statement of objections filed by the respondents.


5. Having heard both the counsel, we find no reason to differ from the judgement delivered

P. L. S.

in application No. 226 of 1986 to which one of us was a party. As the facts of the present application are identical to those of application No.226 of 1986, the directions issued in the order dated 24.10.1986 while disposing of that application will also apply to this application.

81 6. These applications are, therefore, disposed of as indicated above, No order as to the costs.

  
(P.Srinivasan)  
Member(AM)  
5/11/86

  
(Ch.K.Ramakrishna Rao)  
Member(JM)